

1
2
3 IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
4 FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
56
7 LAWRENCE ROMANECK,
8 Plaintiff,

9 v.

10 DEUTSCHE ASSET MANAGEMENT,
11 et al.,
12 Defendants.
13

NO. C05-2473 TEH

ORDER VACATING TRIAL
AND PRETRIAL DATES


14 The Court is in receipt of the parties' stipulation to continue the trial and certain
15 pretrial dates and deadlines in this case. The reason for the parties' request is that the hearing
16 on Defendants' motion for summary judgment is currently scheduled only four days prior to
17 the deadline for the parties' first set of pretrial filings. The hearing on Defendants' motion
18 was originally scheduled for July 24, but the Court granted the parties' stipulation to continue
19 that hearing to allow for further settlement discussions. Although the parties requested only
20 a one-week continuance, the Court was not available until three weeks later. Thus, while the
21 Court's unavailability is in part responsible for the delay in this case, the impetus for the
22 delay was the parties' request for a one-week extension of the briefing deadlines and hearing
23 date.

24 Rather than set new trial dates now, the Court instead finds good cause to vacate the
25 trial date, pretrial conference date, and deadlines for pretrial filings. The parties shall appear
26 for a further case management conference to set new trial and pretrial dates on **Monday,**
27 **August 28, 2006, at 1:30 PM.** The parties shall meet and confer and file a joint case
28 management statement on or before **August 21, 2006.** The Court will endeavor to provide

1 the parties with a ruling on Defendants' motion prior to that date so that the parties can
2 provide an accurate estimate for the length of trial.

3
4 **IT IS SO ORDERED.**

5
6 Dated: 07/27/06



THELTON E. HENDERSON, JUDGE
UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT